

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. No amendments are being made. No new matter is being introduced.

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayuzumi *et al.* (U.S. 5,781,191) in view Perks *et al.* (U.S. 5,764,960).

Perks *et al.* discloses a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that may include text components, picture components, or graphics components ("components"). A user can select or "highlight" one or more components through use of a computer mouse, for example. Through use of a menu bar having menu items with drop-down menus, the user can apply an operation to the highlighted component(s). As disclosed by Perks *et al.* in Figs. 3-7, a "Selected" menu bar item, when selected (i.e., "clicked on") by the user via a computer mouse, for example, displays its drop-down menu. The "Selected" drop-down menu includes optional commands (e.g., "Open as", "Font type", "Bring to front", etc.) that can be applied to the highlighted component(s). When multiple components are highlighted, the "Selected" drop-down menu may include more options than if only one component is highlighted.

In operation, regardless of whether a single component or multiple components are highlighted, the user first highlights a component in the GUI then directs his or her attention to the menu bar for selection of one of the menu bar items, such as the "Selected" menu bar item (see Perks *et al.*, Figs 3-7 and related description in column 5, lines 1-64). Following selection of the "Selected" menu bar item, the user directs his or her attention to the "Selected" drop-down menu and finally to the list of optional commands. Thus, the drop-down menu is not "directing the user's attention to a first selectable graphical user area," as recited in Applicants' Claim 1; instead, Perks *et al.* discloses directing the user's attention away from the selectable graphical user areas, no matter how many components are highlighted.

In addition, since Perks *et al.* assumes the user highlights one of the components before choosing the "Selected" drop-down menu, this implies the user knows how to use the GUI software application (i.e., which selectable graphical user area to interact with first, which to interact with second, and so forth). Because Perks *et al.* assumes the user knows how to use the

software, Perks *et al.* does not provide a mechanism for “directing a user’s attention to a first selectable graphical user area.”

Moreover, the Perks *et al.* drop-down menu optional commands can be executed in any order by the user. Thus, because Perks *et al.* purposely allows the user to execute the commands in any order, Perks *et al.* does not disclose “(i) a first step indication associated with a first step in a given task . . . and (ii) a next step indication associated with a next step in the given task . . .”, as also recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully suggest that Perks *et al.* teaches away from Applicants’ invention as recited in Claim 1 for at least the reasons described above.

Mayuzumi *et al.* discloses displaying help screens in a GUI manner. The help screens are successively displayed in response to a user’s interaction with the help screens (Col. 22, lines 4-7). Since the help screens are distinct from the GUI in a manner similar to the Perk’s *et al.* drop-down menus, the Mayuzumi *et al.* help screens are not “directing the user’s attention to a first selectable graphical user area,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. Further, a Mayuzumi *et al.* help screen is not a “graphical overlay” as also recited in Claim 1. For these reasons, Mayuzumi *et al.* also teaches away from Applicants’ invention as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, neither Perks *et al.* nor Mayuzumi *et al.*, either alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or provide motivation for Claim 1 in its entirety. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 12, 23, and 24 include similar claim limitations as Claim 1 and should be allowable for similar reasons as described above.

For at least the same reasons, dependent Claims 2-11, 13-22, and 25-34 should also be allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all now pending claims (Claims 1-34) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon  
Mark B. Solomon  
Registration No. 44,348  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 2/4/04